UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,162	01/03/2006	Per Jakobsen	941-012259-US (PAR)	2687

2512 7590 09/30/2008

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER	
COLUCCI, MICHAEL C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/539,162	JAKOBSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL C. COLUCCI	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-35 and 37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-35 and 37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 June 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

NOTE: Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 13 and 36.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 06/26/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument 1 (page 12 paragraph 2):

- "One will not be motivated to take a system such as Lisle having a dictionary system based on a frequency of use and combine it with a system that generates text based on keystroke inputs to achieve a system where words are coded with references to a dictionary, where the references are strings of keystrokes through which the predictive editor program can retrieve the words to be used from said language dependent dictionary. Therefore, motivation, as required for purposes of 35 USC §103(a) is not established"

Argument 2 (page 13 paragraph 1):

- "Furthermore, the proposed combination of Haestrup and Lisle does not disclose or suggest each feature recited by Applicant in the claims. Claim 1 recites that a program is capable of compressing text data by replacing words with "references" to a language dependent dictionary, or decompressing text data by retrieving words from the language dependent

dictionary, where the "references" are strings of keystrokes through which the predictive editor program can retrieve the words to be used from the language dependent dictionary."

Response to arguments 1 and 2:

Examiner takes the position that Haestrup in fact teaches text based on keystroke inputs to achieve a system where words are coded with references to a dictionary, where the references are strings of keystrokes through which the predictive editor program can retrieve the words to be used from said language dependent dictionary. Haestrup teaches the ability to generate the intended text onto the screen from ambiguous keystrokes entered on a phone keypad, requiring only one keystroke per letter. This provides a more efficient method of entering text than the traditional multi-tap method requiring many more keystrokes per letter due to the multiple mappings of letters to a given key. The predictive editor program makes this possible because it is based on a large intelligent dictionary that allows the editor to predict what word the user intended based on the number of key-presses and combination of key-presses. Often several words will match the keystrokes that are input and the user chooses the desired match from those offered by the predictive editor program (Col. 4 lines 40-55).

Further, Haestrup teaches vocabulary modules 41a, 41b, 41c, . . . 41N that work in parallel and respond individually if they contain data matching the current key stroke sequence. One vocabulary module 41a might include a dictionary containing words in a language, e.g. English, defined by the user and used as editing language. According to the preferred embodiment some of the vocabulary modules 41a, 41b, 41c, . . . 41N may contain personalized user defined words, e.g entered by using the standard editor of the phone (when the predictive editor did not find the word the user was looking for) or by copying the names from the phonebook into one of the vocabulary modules (Col. 3 lines 47-58).

Furthermore, Haestrup teaches a communication terminal having a display; a keypad having a plurality of keys associated with several letters each; processor means controlling the display means in accordance with the operation of the keypad; a selectively activatable predictive editor program for generating an output containing word matching a received string of ambiguous key strokes; an editor application controlled by the processor means for editing a text based on the predictive editor programs interpretation of key strokes, and said editor application comprises means for storing string of entered words, means for storing a sequence of key stokes, said sequence is updated upon the occurrence of a new key stroke, and being used as input to the predictive editor program, means for storing a list of matching words received from said predictive editor

program. The processor means combines the text string and one word from the list of matching words for displaying in the display of at least a part of said text string and one word from the list of matching words, said one word from the list of matching words is marked in comparison to the remaining part of the text string and added to the text string upon acknowledgement by the user. The terminal has acknowledging means including a key on the keypad indicating that a word suggested by said predictive editor program is a part of a compound word, said editor application fixes the suggested word as an acknowledged part of the compound word, resets said sequence of key stokes serving as input for said predictive editor program in order to determine another part of the compound word independently of the acknowledged part of the compound word (Col. 1 lines 27-58).

Though it is very well known to use compression and decompression with the use of language dictionaries, Haestrup teaches compression, the Lisle reference was incorporated in order to strengthen prior art through the combination of Haestrup in view of Lisle. (For well known methods of dictionary compression: "Salomon, Data Compression - The Complete Reference, 4th Ed.", pages 171-261)

Lisle teaches a text compression technique in the invention at hand is one that addresses the degree of repetitive occurrence and the length of certain words in

the basic language of the persons generating and utilizing the text. Many options are provided. The options may be tailored to specific environments and to specific documents themselves by selecting the basic dictionary type employed. Either a predefined existing dictionary or dictionaries that have been generated especially for text compression or dictionaries that are created on-line for the individual text itself may be utilized in combination or separately. The dictionaries are arranged on byte wide boundaries of addresses to simplify processing. Those dictionaries that have a single byte address utilize the highest degree of compression but are also of limited length since only 256 different entries can exist for a given 8-bit byte. Dictionaries for graphics displays and audio playback are also permitted since these are merely digital representations of specific signals for output by graphic or audio devices. Obviously, the technique is not limited to English language. Virtually any character-spelled language may be similarly treated by our methods (Lisle Col. 5 lines 22-50).

Further, Lisle teaches a very well known dictionary scheme utilizing an escape code or dictionary indication code to show to the decompression system when a compressed word has been taken from a dictionary file and to indicate, by its absence, that the word is not compressed and is transmitted to ordinary ASCII or EBCDIC characters. Pointers for escape characters identify themselves as pointers and indicate the dictionary entry for the word that they represent. Source files of EBCDIC or ASCII encoded text are read one word at a time and

the words are compared against the dictionary. If the word is not found, the word and any trailing delimiter such as punctuation marks or spaces are written unchanged into the compressed file. If the word is found, a pointer indicating that the word was found in the dictionary and pointing to the dictionary location is written to the compressed file. (Lisle Col. 2 line 35 – Col. 3 line 11).

It is clear that pointers are used as a form of reference during the compression of the language dictionary taught by Lisle, wherein text is referenced/pointed and compressed/decompressed.

Therefore the combination of Haestrup in view of Lisle allows for the use of compression and decompression by reference that can be applied to any system that utilizes a language dictionary, wherein a phone, computer, or other device utilizes the language dictionary while maintaining the dictionaries attributes, wherein pointing to a location of a word in a dictionary that refers the pointing operation to a list of keystroke words/strings in a specific language or group of languages (Lisle Col. 2 line 35 – Col. 3 line 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20-27, 29-35, and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haestrup US 6223059 B1 (hereinafter Haestrup) in view of Lisle et al. US 4843389 A (hereinafter Lisle).

Re claim 1, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal (Fig. 1) comprising:

- a display (Fig. 1 item 3);

- means for entering text (Col. 1 lines 27-58 & Fig. 1 item 7);

- a predictive editor program for generating an output containing words completing a received string of ambiguous keystrokes or matching a received string of ambiguous keystrokes (Col. 1 lines 27-58 & Fig. 1 item 7), said predictive editor program has a number of associated vocabularies (Col. 3 lines 8-15) forming a language dependent dictionary (Col 3 line 58 – Col. 4 line 5);

and

- at least one further program that is capable of compressing text data by replacing words with references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 4 lines 25-38).

dictionary using references to said language dependent dictionary, wherein the references are strings of keystrokes through which the predictive editor program can retrieve the words to be used from said language dependent dictionary (Col. 1 lines 27-58)

However, Haestrup fails to teach decompressing text data by retrieving words from said language dependent dictionary using references to said language dependent dictionary

compressing text data by replacing words with references to said language dependent dictionary

Lisle teaches providing a plurality of language use specific dictionaries whose entries of words are ranked in a weighted frequency of usage ranking based on statistical studies of the areas of use employed. For example, words such as "docket" or "versus" or "case" will appear much more frequently in legal texts than in normal English usage. Similar professional jargon is found for other fields as well, engineering, business, accounting, medicine, agriculture, petro-chemicals, etc., etc., ad infinitum being possibilities. In the present invention, the user of a text compression and decompression system builds up dictionaries that are custom-tailored to the field of use. This is done by utilizing a scanning and analysis technique that incorporates counting both the number of characters in each unique word and the number of occurrences of the word within the general usage over a sample of texts from the user's environment. Multiple such dictionaries can be constructed and applied to maximum beneficial effect to achieve a high degree of compression for an individual user (Lisle Col. 4 lines 12-32).

Further, Lisle teaches a text compression technique in the invention at hand is one that addresses the degree of repetitive occurrence and the length of certain words in the basic language of the persons generating and utilizing the text. Many options are provided. The options may be tailored to specific environments and to specific

documents themselves by selecting the basic dictionary type employed. Either a predefined existing dictionary or dictionaries that have been generated especially for text compression or dictionaries that are created on-line for the individual text itself may be utilized in combination or separately. The dictionaries are arranged on byte wide boundaries of addresses to simplify processing. Those dictionaries that have a single byte address utilize the highest degree of compression but are also of limited length since only 256 different entries can exist for a given 8-bit byte. Dictionaries for graphics displays and audio playback are also permitted since these are merely digital representations of specific signals for output by graphic or audio devices. Obviously, the technique is not limited to English language. Virtually any character-spelled language may be similarly treated by our methods (Lisle Col. 5 lines 22-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup to incorporate compressing or decompressing text data by replacing words with references to said language dependent dictionary as taught by Lisle because to allow for the use of compression and decompression by reference that can be applied to any system that utilizes a language dictionary, wherein a phone, computer, or other device utilizes the language dictionary while maintaining the dictionaries attributes, wherein pointing to a location of a word in a dictionary that refers the pointing operation to a list of keystroke words/strings in a specific language or group of languages (Lisle Col. 2 line 35 – Col. 3 line 11).

Re claims 2 and 21, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program identifies words in data that is represented as a sequence of characters drawn from an alphabet in an input data block and processes it into an output data block in which character combinations (Col. 5 line 67 – Col. 6 line 9) that correspond to words contained in said language dependent dictionary are replaced by references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 7 lines 10-19).

Re claim 3, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, in which said second program saves the words in said text as references to said language dependent dictionary and/or retrieves words from said language dependent dictionary using stored or received references (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claims 4 and 23, mobile terminal according to claim 1, in which said second program sends data incorporating references to said language dependent dictionary to other terminals and/or retrieves words from said language dependent dictionary through references from data received from other terminals (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6 & Fig. 2 item 20).

Re claims 5 and 24, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program is a terminal operation program, said terminal operation program having at least one associated language data set for outputting text

to the display, and said language data set contains references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claims 6 and 25, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program is a program for storing and retrieving text messages to and from said terminal and said program for storing and retrieving text messages stores words of said text messages as references to said language dependent dictionary and retrieve words of said text messages from said language dependent dictionary using stored or received references (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claims 7 and 26, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program is a message handling program (Col. 1 lines 27-58 & Fig. 1 item 7) that sends text messages to other terminals, preferably PCs, servers or mobile phones (Col. 2 lines 32-41 & Fig. 2 item 20), whereby said text message contains references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claims 8 and 31, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program is an application program interface (API) (Col. 3 lines 8-15 & Fig. 3) that stores downloaded text data as references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claim 9, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program is a calendaring or task management program (Col. 3 lines 15-19) that stores text entries as references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claim 11, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said further program stores said references on- or retrieves said references (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6) from a removable data carrier (Fig. 2 item 16).

Re claims 12 and 35, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said references are direct references to addresses in said language dependent dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claim 14, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said means for entering text comprises a keypad having plurality of keys, preferably a plurality of keys associated with several letters each (Col. 5 lines 7-36 & Table 1).

Re claim 16, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to 14, characterized in that said keypad comprises discrete mechanical keys, and preferably a number of soft keys (Col. 5 lines 7-36 & Table 1).

Re claims 17 and 37, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in said mobile terminal is a communication terminal, preferably a mobile phone comprising processor means, memory means, digital signal processing means, RF transmitting and receiving circuitry, a microphone, a speaker and preferably a SIM card or other removable card having storage capacity (Fig. 2).

Re claim 20, Haestrup teaches a method of compressing data (Col. 4 lines 25-38) in a mobile terminal (Fig. 1) comprising:

storing a language dependent dictionary on said mobile terminal (Col 3 line 58 – Col. 4 line 5);

compressing text data (Col. 4 lines 25-38) on said mobile terminal by replacing words in said text data with references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 4 lines 25-38)

decompressing text data by retrieving words from said language dependent dictionary using references to said language dependent dictionary (Lisle Col. 4 lines 12-32).

Lisle teaches providing a plurality of language use specific dictionaries whose entries of words are ranked in a weighted frequency of usage ranking based on statistical studies of the areas of use employed. For example, words such as "docket" or "versus" or "case" will appear much more frequently in legal texts than in normal English usage. Similar professional jargon is found for other fields as well, engineering, business, accounting, medicine, agriculture, petro-chemicals, etc., etc., ad infinitum

being possibilities. In the present invention, the user of a text compression and decompression system builds up dictionaries that are custom-tailored to the field of use. This is done by utilizing a scanning and analysis technique that incorporates counting both the number of characters in each unique word and the number of occurrences of the word within the general usage over a sample of texts from the user's environment. Multiple such dictionaries can be constructed and applied to maximum beneficial effect to achieve a high degree of compression for an individual user.

Further, Lisle teaches a text compression technique in the invention at hand is one that addresses the degree of repetitive occurrence and the length of certain words in the basic language of the persons generating and utilizing the text. Many options are provided. The options may be tailored to specific environments and to specific documents themselves by selecting the basic dictionary type employed. Either a predefined existing dictionary or dictionaries that have been generated especially for text compression or dictionaries that are created on-line for the individual text itself may be utilized in combination or separately. The dictionaries are arranged on byte wide boundaries of addresses to simplify processing. Those dictionaries that have a single byte address utilize the highest degree of compression but are also of limited length since only 256 different entries can exist for a given 8-bit byte. Dictionaries for graphics displays and audio playback are also permitted since these are merely digital representations of specific signals for output by graphic or audio devices. Obviously, the technique is not limited to English language. Virtually any character-spelled language may be similarly treated by our methods (Lisle Col. 5 lines 22-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup to incorporate compressing or decompressing text data by replacing words with references to said language dependent dictionary as taught by Lisle because to allow for the use of compression and decompression by reference that can be applied to any system that utilizes a language dictionary, wherein a phone, computer, or other device utilizes the language dictionary while maintaining the dictionaries attributes, wherein pointing to a location of a word in a dictionary that refers the pointing operation to a list of keystroke words/strings in a specific language or group of languages (Lisle Col. 2 line 35 – Col. 3 line 11).

Re claim 22, Haestrup teaches a method according to claim 20, further comprising:

- saving said output data block onto a fixed or removable memory of said mobile communication terminal (Fig. 2);

and/or retrieving words from said language dependent dictionary through stored references (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6).

Re claim 27, Haestrup teaches a method according to claim 20, further comprising:

attaching a reference to the used language, and/or the used dictionary (Col 3 line 58 – Col. 4 line 5).

Re claim 29, Haestrup teaches a method according to claim 20, in which words not present in the dictionary are not replaced by references to the language dependent dictionary and remain plain text (Col. 7 lines 35-48), or if possible are replaced by a plurality of references to parts of the word that are present in the language dependent dictionary (Col. 10 lines 10-24).

Re claim 30, Haestrup teaches a method according to claim 20, further comprising the step of:

retrieving words from said language dependent database through references received in text messages (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6) from other terminals, preferably PCs, servers or mobile communication terminals (Col. 2 lines 32-41 & Fig. 2 item 20).

Re claim 32, Haestrup teaches a method according claim 20, wherein said language dependent dictionary is a dictionary associated with a predictive editing program (Col. 1 lines 27-58 & Fig. 1 item 7) that receives unambiguous keystrokes (Fig. 8).

Re claim 33, Haestrup teaches a method according to any of claims 20, wherein said language dependent dictionary is a dictionary associated with a predictive editing program that receives ambiguous keystrokes (Col. 1 lines 27-58 & Fig. 1 item 7).

Re claim 34, Haestrup teaches a method according to claim 20, wherein said language dependent dictionary is a dictionary (Col. 8 line 50 – Col. 9 line 6) associated with a spell checking function of a text editing program (Col. 7 lines 61-67).

4. Claims 10, 15, 18, 19, 38, and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haestrup US 6223059 B1 (hereinafter Haestrup) in view of Lisle et al. US 4843389 A (hereinafter Lisle) and further in view of Barbosa et al. US 20040192329 A1 (hereinafter Barbosa).

Re claim 10, Haestrup teaches a mobile terminal according to claim 1, calendar entries or tasks between the mobile terminal and other terminals (Col. 2 lines 32-41 & Fig. 2 item 20) that store text entries as references to said language dependent dictionary (Col. 2 lines 32-41 & Fig. 2 item 20).

However, Haestrup in view of Lisle fails to teach a synchronization program for synchronizing data

Barbosa teaches a worker's handheld device (or device assigned to the worker for the shift) may be synchronized 901 with a server to receive an updated template containing tasks for the worker at the beginning of every work shift. A project member beginning a workday at a job site or on a shared project would generally be expected to ascertain the status of the project and attempt to complete tasks embodied within a template. The projects tasks and template are generally expected to be completed by the worker 902 during and before the end of a shift. The worker reports 903 on the

status of tasks at the end of the workday via synchronization with a server through wired and/or wireless means (Barbosa [0060] & Fig. 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup in view of Lisle to incorporate synchronization capabilities between terminals as taught by Barbosa to allow for the ability of one terminal to update any number of additional terminals automatically, where a specific task can be processed and tracked through a server wirelessly, rendering a list of tasks transmitted (Barbosa [0060] & Fig. 6).

Re claim 15, Haestrup in view of Lisle fails to teach a mobile terminal according to claim 14, characterized in that said keypad comprises keys displayed on a touch screen.

Barbosa teaches a handheld data management device in accordance with the present invention may be in the form of any one of a number of commercially available hand-held devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs), two-way pagers, and Web/WAP-enabled mobile phones. Referring to FIG. 1, a device 10 exemplary of a prior art PDA that could implement software and/or communication methods in accordance with carrying out methods of the invention is illustrated. The device 10 includes an outer housing 12 sufficiently small to be easily portable such that it substantially fit within the palm of a users hand, a display 14 that may also preferably include touch-screen technology to operate in combination with control buttons 16 to provide a User Interface (UI) for operating, controlling and/or otherwise interacting with

the device 10. Not shown on the device 10, but well known in the art to be incorporated in such devices are communication ports (wired and wireless) (Barbosa [0046]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup in view of Lisle to incorporate a keypad with touch screen capability as taught by Barbosa to allow for a broad range of methods to enter data, such as with the use of a stylus or even the use of ones fingernail rather than a finger tip. Additionally, someone with the inability to press mechanical keypads may find it easier to use a touch screen technology. A PDA is well known to incorporate the use of a touch screen (Barbosa [0046]).

Re claims 18 and 38, Haestrup in view of Lisle fail to teach a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said mobile terminal is a personal, digital assistant (PDA).

Barbosa teaches a handheld data management device in accordance with the present invention may be in the form of any one of a number of commercially available hand-held devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs), two-way pagers, and Web/WAP-enabled mobile phones. Referring to FIG. 1, a device 10 exemplary of a prior art PDA that could implement software and/or communication methods in accordance with carrying out methods of the invention is illustrated. The device 10 includes an outer housing 12 sufficiently small to be easily portable such that it substantially fit within the palm of a users hand, a display 14 that may also preferably include touch-screen technology to operate in combination with control buttons 16 to

provide a User Interface (UI) for operating, controlling and/or otherwise interacting with the device 10. Not shown on the device 10, but well known in the art to be incorporated in such devices are communication ports (wired and wireless) (Barbosa [0046]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup in view of Lisle to incorporate using a PDA as a mobile terminal incorporating the uses of a mobile phone as taught by Barbosa to allow for function similar to that of a PC, where in additional to tasks (calendar, address, etc.), the ability to communicate through the operation of a mobile phone introduces a user friendly operation. The combination of a mobile phone and PDA allow for the design of a Smartphone such as Simon (Barbosa [0046]).

Re claims 19 and 39, Haestrup in view of Lisle fail to teach a mobile terminal according to claim 1, characterized in that said mobile terminal is a combination of a mobile phone and a personal digital assistant

Barbosa teaches a handheld data management device in accordance with the present invention may be in the form of any one of a number of commercially available hand-held devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs), two-way pagers, and Web/WAP-enabled mobile phones. Referring to FIG. 1, a device 10 exemplary of a prior art PDA that could implement software and/or communication methods in accordance with carrying out methods of the invention is illustrated. The device 10 includes an outer housing 12 sufficiently small to be easily portable such that it substantially fit within the palm of a users hand, a display 14 that may also preferably

include touch-screen technology to operate in combination with control buttons 16 to provide a User Interface (UI) for operating, controlling and/or otherwise interacting with the device 10. Not shown on the device 10, but well known in the art to be incorporated in such devices are communication ports (wired and wireless) (Barbosa [0046]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup in view of Lisle to incorporate using a PDA as a mobile terminal incorporating the uses of a mobile phone as taught by Barbosa to allow for function similar to that of a PC, where in additional to tasks (calendar, address, etc.), the ability to communicate through the operation of a mobile phone introduces a user friendly operation. The combination of a mobile phone and PDA allow for the design of a Smartphone (such as the Smartphone Simon introduced in 1992) (Barbosa [0046]).

5. Claim 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haestrup US 6223059 B1 (hereinafter Haestrup) in view of Lisle et al. US 4843389 A (hereinafter Lisle) and further in view of Adams et al. US 5490211 A (hereinafter Adams).

Re claim 28, Haestrup teaches said language dependent dictionary (Col. 4 lines 25-38)

the references replaced by the corresponding words as plain text (Col. 4 lines 25-38)

However, Haestrup in view of Lisle fails to teach a method according to claim 27, wherein said text message is sent to said other terminal via a dedicated terminal having a copy, whereby said dedicated terminal retrieves the words of said text message and passes the text message on to said other terminal

Adams teaches the central processing unit 24, FIG. 1, determines if a send message request was initiated at the display terminal 36. If a send message was requested, the program proceeds to step 116 of FIG. 3C. In step 116, FIG. 3C, a determination is made if a written text message is being sent to another or destination display terminal 36B, 36C-N coupled with the automatic call distributor 20. If the written data text message is not sent to a display terminal 36 the operation goes to step 117, to send a message to a network supervisor terminal 50, FIG. 1. The processing is completed for the send message request at step 129. If the written text message from the sending display terminal 36 is being sent to a destination display terminal 36B, then in step 118 information relating to the identification of the sending display terminal, the day of the week, day of the month, year, hour and minute that the written text message was sent from the sending terminal is stored in the message build area of the switch operations memory 26. In step 120, FIG. 3C, the sent written text message in copied into the message build storage of the central processing unit 24, FIG. 1, switch operations memory 26 (Adams Col. 10 lines 14-35 & Fig. 3c).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Haestrup in view of Lisle to incorporate retrieving and replacing words and having a copy of a language dictionary on a

dedicated terminal as taught by Barbosa to allow for the backup of continuously updated and transmitted data, where various terminals can receive the same data for editing/verification purposes in addition to backing up data on different terminals (Adams Col. 10 lines 14-35 & Fig. 3c).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Colucci whose telephone number is (571)-270-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C Colucci/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
Patent Examiner
AU 2626
(571)-270-1847
Michael.Colucci@uspto.gov

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626